

Charge and Spin Response of the Spin-Polarized Electron Gas

K. S. Yi^{1,2} and J. J. Quinn^{1,3}

¹ *Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee 37996*

² *Department of Physics, Pusan National University, Pusan 609-735, Korea*

and

³ *Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37831*

(February 1, 2008)

The charge and spin response of a spin-polarized electron gas is investigated including terms beyond the random phase approximation. We evaluate the charge response, the longitudinal and transverse spin response, and the mixed spin-charge response self-consistently in terms of the susceptibility functions of a non-interacting system. Exchange-correlation effects between electrons of spin σ and σ' are included following Kukkonen and Overhauser, by using spin-polarization dependent generalized Hubbard local field factors $G_{\sigma}^{\pm}$ and $G_{\sigma'}^{\pm}$. The general condition for charge-density and spin-density-wave excitations of the system is discussed.

PACS: 71.10Ca 71.45.Gm

Response functions relate the induced charge and spin densities to the strength of an external disturbance and play an important role in the understanding of many-body systems. The spin-polarized electron gas (SPEG) is an n -electron system with n_{σ} electrons of spin σ and $n_{\bar{\sigma}}$ electrons of spin $\bar{\sigma}$ embedded in a uniform positive charge background. (The volume of the system is taken to be unity in this work.) Previous investigations of the response of the spin polarized electron system were limited in scope. Some focussed on the paramagnetic response¹ or on the charge and spin-density fluctuations of a ferromagnetic electron gas within the Hartree-Fock (HF) approximation². Others used the random phase approximation (RPA)³, local spin-density functional theory⁴, or were limited to the infinitesimally polarized electron liquid⁵. However, the role of correlations beyond the RPA in the charge-spin response has never been examined explicitly for the case of arbitrary spin polarization $0 \leq |\zeta| \leq 1$, where $\zeta = (n_{\sigma} - n_{\bar{\sigma}})/(n_{\sigma} + n_{\bar{\sigma}})$.

The purpose of this paper is to present a treatment of charge and spin response in a unified way. The self-consistent effective potential experienced by an electron of spin $\vec{s}$ is expressed in terms of the charge density fluctuation δn and the spin density fluctuation $\delta \vec{m}$. The exchange-correlation interactions between electrons of the same spin (ss) or of opposite spins ($s\bar{s}$) are included by employing Hubbard-type spin-dependent local-field factors $G_s^{\pm}$ and $G_{\bar{s}}^{\pm}$. The self-consistent linear response method of Kukkonen and Overhauser⁶ is extended to a SPEG by generalizing the local field factor. The charge and spin response to an arbitrary electric and magnetic disturbance is derived and compared with the existing theories.

We consider an electron gas in the presence of a uniform positive charge background. The imbalance in the populations of up and down spins forming a system of SPEG is caused by an *effective* dc magnetic field whose origin needs not be specified in detail. Any degree of spin polarization ζ can be obtained by adjusting the value of the *effective* magnetic field B . We assume the SPEG is

disturbed by an infinitesimal external electric potential $v_0^{ext}(\vec{r})$ and magnetic field $\vec{b}_0(\vec{r}, t)$. In response to these external electric and magnetic disturbances, charge and spin fluctuations are set up in the system, and the Hamiltonian for an electron with spin $\vec{s}$ can be approximated as

$$H = H_0 + H_1^s, \quad (1)$$

where H_0 is the Hamiltonian of a single quasiparticle of the SPEG in the absence of the external disturbance. H_1^s is the spin-dependent self-consistent effective perturbation. The eigenstates and eigenvalues of H_0 are given by $|\vec{k}, \sigma\rangle$ and $\varepsilon_{\sigma}(k)$. In this work we assume the spin-splitting is much greater than the Landau level splitting and ignore any degree of orbital quantization. Since the most general disturbance can be decomposed into its Fourier components, we choose the disturbances v_0^{ext} , $\vec{b}_0$ and H_1^s to vary as $\sim e^{i\omega t - i\vec{q} \cdot \vec{r}}$. The self-consistent magnetic disturbance $\vec{b}$ is the sum of $\vec{b}_0$ and $4\pi\vec{m}$, where $\vec{m}$ is the induced magnetization. The Fourier component of the most general $H_1^s(\vec{r}, t)$ can be written as⁷

$$H_1^s(q, \omega) = \gamma_0 \vec{s} \cdot \vec{b} + v_0^{ext} + v(q)[\delta n (1 - G_s^+) - \vec{s} \cdot \delta \vec{m} G_s^-]. \quad (2)$$

In Eq. (2), for the sake of brevity, the $\vec{q}$ and ω dependence of the local fields, fluctuations, and disturbances has not been displayed. The parameter γ_0 is given by $\gamma_0 = \frac{1}{2}g^*\mu_B$ with g^* , μ_B , $\vec{s}$, and $v(q)$ being the effective g -factor, the Bohr magneton, Pauli spin operator, and the Fourier transform of the bare Coulombic potential, respectively. Equation (2) is the generalization of the effective interaction Hamiltonian of the SPEG in the presence of infinitesimal magnetic and electric disturbances. The local fields G_s^+ and G_s^- are responsible for charge- and spin-induced correlation effects on an electron of spin s ⁶

$$G_s^{\pm} = G_{ss}^{xc} \pm G_{s\bar{s}}^c, \quad G_{\bar{s}}^{\pm} = G_{\bar{s}\bar{s}}^{xc} \pm G_{\bar{s}s}^c, \quad (3)$$

where G_{ss}^{xc} ($G_{\bar{s}\bar{s}}^{xc}$) and $G_{s\bar{s}}^c$ ($G_{\bar{s}s}^c$) account for the parallel-spin exchange-correlation and the antiparallel-spin correlation effects in linear response theory.

The charge- and spin-density fluctuations $\delta n(q, \omega)$, $\delta m_i(q, \omega)$ ($i = z, +$, and $-$) are given, in terms of the self-consistent effective perturbation $H_1^s(q, \omega)$, using the equation-of-motion of the density matrix⁸.

By taking the matrix element of the effective perturbation, Eq. (2), with respect to eigenstates $|\vec{k}, s\rangle$, then Fourier transforming the resulting expressions and combining the results with the definitions of charge- and spin-density fluctuations, we obtain the coupled equations for $\langle s_1 | H_1^s(\vec{q}, \omega) | s_2 \rangle$ in terms of the external charge and spin disturbances. We then solve the coupled equations for $\langle s_1 | H_1^s | s_2 \rangle$ and substitute the corresponding matrix elements back into the expressions of the fluctuations. The charge-density fluctuation δn , longitudinal spin-density fluctuation δm_z , and transverse spin-density fluctuations δm_+ and δm_- can then be expressed in terms of a susceptibility matrix $\underline{\chi}$ as

$$\begin{pmatrix} -e\delta n \\ \gamma_0 \delta m_z \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \chi^{ee} & \chi^{em} \\ \chi^{me} & \chi^{mm} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \varphi_0^{ext} \\ b_{0z} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (4)$$

and

$$\begin{pmatrix} \gamma_0 \delta m_+ \\ \gamma_0 \delta m_- \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \chi_+^{mm} & 0 \\ 0 & \chi_-^{mm} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} b_0^+ \\ b_0^- \end{pmatrix}. \quad (5)$$

Here $b_0^\pm = b_{0x} \pm ib_{0y}$, and φ_0^{ext} denotes the external electric potential corresponding to the external disturbance $v_0^{ext} (= -e\varphi_0^{ext})$. The various susceptibilities are written as

$$\chi^{ee}(q, \omega) = \frac{e^2}{D} [\Pi_{\sigma\sigma}^0 + \Pi_{\bar{\sigma}\bar{\sigma}}^0 - 16\pi\gamma_0 \Pi_{\sigma\sigma}^0 \Pi_{\bar{\sigma}\bar{\sigma}}^0 + 2v \Pi_{\sigma\sigma}^0 \Pi_{\bar{\sigma}\bar{\sigma}}^0 (G_{\bar{\sigma}}^- + G_{\sigma}^-)], \quad (6)$$

$$\chi^{em}(q, \omega) = -\frac{e\gamma_0}{D} [\Pi_{\sigma\sigma}^0 - \Pi_{\bar{\sigma}\bar{\sigma}}^0 + 2v \Pi_{\sigma\sigma}^0 \Pi_{\bar{\sigma}\bar{\sigma}}^0 (G_{\bar{\sigma}}^- - G_{\sigma}^-)], \quad (7)$$

$$\chi^{me}(q, \omega) = -\frac{e\gamma_0}{D} [\Pi_{\sigma\sigma}^0 - \Pi_{\bar{\sigma}\bar{\sigma}}^0 + 2v \Pi_{\sigma\sigma}^0 \Pi_{\bar{\sigma}\bar{\sigma}}^0 (G_{\bar{\sigma}}^+ - G_{\sigma}^+)], \quad (8)$$

$$\chi_{\parallel}^{mm}(q, \omega) = \frac{\gamma_0^2}{D} [\Pi_{\sigma\sigma}^0 + \Pi_{\bar{\sigma}\bar{\sigma}}^0 - 2v \Pi_{\sigma\sigma}^0 \Pi_{\bar{\sigma}\bar{\sigma}}^0 (2 - G_{\bar{\sigma}}^+ - G_{\sigma}^+)], \quad (9)$$

$$\chi_+^{mm}(q, \omega) = \frac{\frac{1}{2}\gamma_0^2 \Pi_{\sigma\sigma}^0}{1 + \frac{1}{2}(vG_{\sigma}^- - 4\pi\gamma_0) \Pi_{\sigma\sigma}^0}, \quad (10)$$

and

$$\chi_-^{mm}(q, \omega) = \frac{\frac{1}{2}\gamma_0^2 \Pi_{\bar{\sigma}\bar{\sigma}}^0}{1 + \frac{1}{2}(vG_{\bar{\sigma}}^- - 4\pi\gamma_0) \Pi_{\bar{\sigma}\bar{\sigma}}^0}. \quad (11)$$

In Eqs. (6) to (11), $\Pi_{s_1 s_2}^0$ is the Lindhard-type electric ($s_1 = s_2$) or spin ($s_1 \neq s_2$) susceptibility.

$$\Pi_{s_1 s_2}^0(q, \omega) = \sum_{\vec{k}} \frac{n_0(\varepsilon_{s_1}(\vec{k} + \vec{q})) - n_0(\varepsilon_{s_2}(\vec{k}))}{\varepsilon_{s_1}(\vec{k} + \vec{q}) - \varepsilon_{s_2}(\vec{k}) - \hbar\omega + i\eta}, \quad (12)$$

where $n_0(\varepsilon_s(\vec{k}))$ denotes the equilibrium distribution of quasiparticles having spin s . The D is given by

$$D(q, \omega) = \frac{1}{2} [1 - 2v \Pi_{\sigma\sigma}^0 (1 - G_{\sigma\sigma}^{xc} - G_{\bar{\sigma}\bar{\sigma}}^c) + 1 + 2v \Pi_{\bar{\sigma}\bar{\sigma}}^0 (G_{\bar{\sigma}\bar{\sigma}}^{xc} - G_{\sigma\sigma}^c) - 8\pi\gamma_0 \Pi_{\bar{\sigma}\bar{\sigma}}^0] + \frac{1}{2} [1 - 2v \Pi_{\sigma\bar{\sigma}}^0 (1 - G_{\sigma\bar{\sigma}}^{xc} - G_{\sigma\bar{\sigma}}^c) + 1 + 2v \Pi_{\sigma\sigma}^0 (G_{\sigma\sigma}^{xc} - G_{\bar{\sigma}\bar{\sigma}}^c) - 8\pi\gamma_0 \Pi_{\sigma\sigma}^0]. \quad (13)$$

The various terms containing factors proportional to $\pi\gamma_0$ in the expressions of susceptibilities have their origin in the use of the self-consistent magnetic disturbance. If we neglect the induced magnetization $\vec{m}$, those terms disappear from the expressions for various susceptibilities. The spin-polarization dependent Fermi wave number of the majority(minority) electrons with spin $\sigma(\bar{\sigma})$ is given by

$$k_{F_{\sigma(\bar{\sigma})}} = k_{F_0} (1 \pm \zeta)^{1/3}, \quad (14)$$

where k_{F_0} is the Fermi wave number for the unpolarized case. The expression of $\Pi_{\bar{\sigma}\bar{\sigma}}^0$ is obtained by replacing the quantities of spin indices σ in the expression of $\Pi_{\sigma\sigma}^0$ by that of $\bar{\sigma}$. The $\Pi_{\sigma\bar{\sigma}}^0$ and $\Pi_{\bar{\sigma}\sigma}^0$ appearing in Eqs. (10) and (11) are the susceptibility functions of the spin-flip processes.

In the absence of the perturbation, the charge densities associated with the majority- and minority-spin electrons are spatially uniform but unequal. Hence they have only a non-vanishing $q = 0$ Fourier component. However, in the SPEG a spatially varying electric or magnetic disturbance with finite wave number q induces electron density fluctuation of each spin, δn_σ and $\delta n_{\bar{\sigma}}$, and hence a finite spin density fluctuation $\delta \vec{m}$. The χ^{ee} , $\chi_{\parallel}^{mm}$, and $\chi_{\pm}^{mm}$ are the ordinary charge-, longitudinal spin-, and transverse spin-susceptibilities, respectively. The off-diagonal mixed susceptibilities χ^{em} (χ^{me}) correspond to the charge density response to a magnetic disturbance (the longitudinal spin density response to an electric disturbance). The susceptibilities given by Eqs. (6) to (11) reduce to appropriate forms for the unpolarized or infinitesimally polarized limits. If we set all the local fields $G_{ss'} = 0$, we obtain the RPA susceptibilities of the spin-polarized system. When $\zeta = 0$, $\Pi_{\sigma\sigma}^0 = \Pi_{\bar{\sigma}\bar{\sigma}}^0$ and $G_{\sigma}^\pm = G_{\bar{\sigma}}^\pm$. In this case, χ^{ee} and $\chi_{\parallel}^{mm}$, respectively, reduce to the well known expressions⁵,

$$\chi_{ee}^{ee}(q, \omega) = \frac{e^2 \Pi_0^0(q, \omega)}{1 - v \Pi_0^0(q, \omega)(1 - G_{\sigma}^+)}, \quad (15)$$

$$\chi_{||}^{mm}(q, \omega) = \frac{\gamma_0^2 \Pi_0^0(q, \omega)}{1 + \Pi_0^0(q, \omega)(v G_{\sigma}^- - 4\pi\gamma_0)}, \quad (16)$$

where $\Pi_0^0 = \Pi_{\sigma\sigma}^0 + \Pi_{\bar{\sigma}\bar{\sigma}}^0 = 2\Pi_{\sigma\sigma}^0$. The mixed responses vanish in the unpolarized system⁶. But, they become finite and equal to each other in the case of infinitesimally polarized system⁵, in which $\Pi_{\sigma\sigma}^0 \neq \Pi_{\bar{\sigma}\bar{\sigma}}^0$ but $G_{\sigma}^{\pm} = G_{\bar{\sigma}}^{\pm}$. However, since it is not necessary that $G_{\sigma\sigma}^c = G_{\bar{\sigma}\bar{\sigma}}^c$ in the system with finite spin polarization, we conjecture from Eqs. (7) and (8) that, for the most general case, the charge–spin cross susceptibilities χ^{em} and χ^{me} could be different. The inequality of the cross-correlation local fields $G_{\sigma\sigma}^c$, $G_{\bar{\sigma}\bar{\sigma}}^c$ is expected from the fact that the density $n_{\sigma}^{(h)}(r)$, associated with the exchange–correlation hole around a given electron with spin σ located at the origin, and with $n_{\bar{\sigma}}^{(h)}(r)$, that around an electron with spin $\bar{\sigma}$, are given in terms of the corresponding pair correlation functions $g_{\sigma\sigma'}(r)$ by

$$n_{\sigma}^{(h)}(r) = n_{\sigma}[1 - g_{\sigma\sigma}(r)] + n_{\bar{\sigma}}[1 - g_{\sigma\bar{\sigma}}(r)], \quad (17)$$

$$n_{\bar{\sigma}}^{(h)}(r) = n_{\bar{\sigma}}[1 - g_{\bar{\sigma}\bar{\sigma}}(r)] + n_{\sigma}[1 - g_{\bar{\sigma}\sigma}(r)]. \quad (18)$$

Equations (17) and (18) show that the $n_{\sigma}^{(h)}(r) \neq n_{\bar{\sigma}}^{(h)}(r)$ in the SPEG. Within the HF or RPA-type approximations, $G_{\sigma\bar{\sigma}}^c = 0 = G_{\bar{\sigma}\sigma}^c$, hence, we have that $\chi^{em} = \chi^{me}$ even in the spin polarized system^{2,3,9}. In the local spin-density approximation⁴, Gunnarsson and Lundqvist observed that $\chi^{em} = \chi^{me}$ by keeping only the diagonal elements of the matrix $\underline{C}$ in their expressions for the off-diagonal charge–spin susceptibilities (Eq. (69) in Ref.⁴). The matrix elements $C_{s,s'}$ in Ref.⁴ are directly related with the local fields $G_{s(\bar{s})}^{\pm}$ in the present work. In the same context, Eqs. (10) and (11) suggest that, in general, the transverse spin response functions $\chi_{+}^{mm}(q, \omega)$ and $\chi_{-}^{mm}(q, \omega)$ could be different in the SPEG. Equations (6) to (11) can be considered as definitions of the wave number- and frequency-dependent local fields $G_{\sigma}^{\pm}$ and $G_{\bar{\sigma}}^{\pm}$, in terms of the corresponding fluctuations, in the SPEG. Within the HF approximation the local fields satisfy the relation $G_{\sigma}^+ = G_{\sigma}^-$ and, hence, the mixed charge–spin response functions become equal ($\chi^{em} = \chi^{me}$).

Because the divergences in these response functions give the collective modes in the system, various susceptibility functions obtained here can be used to investigate the collective modes such as charge–density and spin–density wave excitations in the SPEG. The coupling of charge–density waves and spin–density waves is expected in the SPEG, and the conditions for the spin–flip transverse modes are written, from Eqs. (10) and (11), by

$$1 + \frac{1}{2}(v G_{\sigma}^- - 4\pi\gamma_0) \Pi_{\sigma\bar{\sigma}}^0 = 0, \quad (19)$$

and

$$1 + \frac{1}{2}(v G_{\bar{\sigma}}^- - 4\pi\gamma_0) \Pi_{\bar{\sigma}\sigma}^0 = 0. \quad (20)$$

For example, the divergence of χ_{-}^{mm} leads us, in a long wavelength limit, to a mode

$$\hbar\omega = 2\gamma_0 B + \frac{n\zeta}{2}(4\pi\gamma_0 - v G_{\bar{\sigma}}^-) + \alpha(\zeta) q^2, \quad (21)$$

where the coefficient α depends, in general, on the degree of spin polarization of the system and reduces to $\alpha(1) = \frac{\hbar^2}{2m}(1 + \frac{6\pi\hbar^2}{5m\gamma_0 k_{F\sigma}})$ for the case of complete spin polarization $\zeta = 1$. The second term of Eq. (21) disappears as the spin polarization of the system vanishes. On the other hand, the general expression for the dispersion relation of the coupled longitudinal modes is given by the zeros of the $D(q, \omega)$ defined by Eq. (13)

$$0 = [1 - v\Pi_{\sigma\sigma}^0(1 - 2G_{\sigma\sigma}^{xc})][1 - v\Pi_{\bar{\sigma}\bar{\sigma}}^0(1 - 2G_{\bar{\sigma}\bar{\sigma}}^{xc})] - 4\pi\gamma_0(\Pi_{\sigma\sigma}^0 + \Pi_{\bar{\sigma}\bar{\sigma}}^0) + 8\pi\gamma_0 v \Pi_{\sigma\sigma}^0 \Pi_{\bar{\sigma}\bar{\sigma}}^0 (2 - G_{\sigma}^+ - G_{\bar{\sigma}}^+) - v^2 \Pi_{\sigma\sigma}^0 \Pi_{\bar{\sigma}\bar{\sigma}}^0 (1 - 2G_{\sigma\sigma}^c)(1 - 2G_{\bar{\sigma}\bar{\sigma}}^c). \quad (22)$$

In RPA, the above expression reduces to

$$1 - (v + 4\pi\gamma_0)(\Pi_{\sigma\sigma}^0 + \Pi_{\bar{\sigma}\bar{\sigma}}^0) + 16\pi v \gamma_0 \Pi_{\sigma\sigma}^0 \Pi_{\bar{\sigma}\bar{\sigma}}^0 = 0, \quad (23)$$

where $\Pi_{\sigma\sigma}^0 \neq \Pi_{\bar{\sigma}\bar{\sigma}}^0$. One can expect, from Eq. (23) coupled modes of charge–density and spin–density wave excitations, with a long wavelength limit dispersion relation given by

$$\omega_{+}(q) = \Omega_{PL} + \frac{\Omega_{PL}}{2} \left[\left(1 - \frac{4n_{\sigma}n_{\bar{\sigma}}}{n^2} \right) \frac{\gamma_0}{e^2} + \frac{9}{5n^2} \left(\frac{n_{\sigma}^2}{q_{TF\sigma}^2} + \frac{n_{\bar{\sigma}}^2}{q_{TF\bar{\sigma}}^2} \right) \right] q^2, \quad (24)$$

$$\omega_{-}(q) = \Omega_{PL} \left[\frac{4n_{\sigma}n_{\bar{\sigma}}}{n^2} \frac{\gamma_0}{e^2} - \frac{9}{5n^2} \left(\frac{n_{\sigma}^2}{q_{TF\sigma}^2} + \frac{n_{\bar{\sigma}}^2}{q_{TF\bar{\sigma}}^2} \right) \right]^{1/2} q. \quad (25)$$

Here Ω_{PL} is the plasma frequency corresponding to the total electron density $n = n_{\sigma} + n_{\bar{\sigma}}$ and $q_{TF\sigma(\bar{\sigma})}$ is the Thomas–Fermi wavenumber¹⁰ of the majority(minority) electrons of spin $\sigma(\bar{\sigma})$. The terms involving γ_0 have their origin in the self-consistent magnetic responses and, especially, those terms containing $4n_{\sigma}n_{\bar{\sigma}}$ result from the coupling of the electric and magnetic responses in Eq. (23). The terms of n_{σ}^2 and $n_{\bar{\sigma}}^2$ are due to the contribution to the noninteracting susceptibility of the extra kinetic energy in the SPEG Fermi sea. The minus sign in Eq. (25) indicates that, in the long wavelength region, the slope of the dispersion of the mode ω_{-} is suppressed in the presence of the coupling between the oscillations of charge density and spin density of the SPEG. When $\zeta = 0$, Eq. (22) reduces as

$$[1 - v\Pi_0^0(1 - G_\sigma^+)] [1 + \Pi_0^0(vG_\sigma^- - 4\pi\gamma_0)] = 0, \quad (26)$$

which is the product of the conditions of self-sustaining oscillations of charge and spin densities in a spin-unpolarized system given by Eqs. (15) and (16). For the case $G_\sigma^\pm = 0$, Eq. (26) reduces to $[1 - v\Pi_0^0][1 - 4\pi\gamma_0\Pi_0^0] = 0$, which is the RPA result of a unpolarized system. The first factor leads us to the well-known charge density wave excitation due to Coulomb interaction¹⁰; $\omega = \Omega_{PL}(1 + \frac{9}{10}\frac{q^2}{q_{TF}^2})$. On the other hand, the second factor gives us the spin density wave excitation, in response to the self-consistent magnetic disturbance, of the spin-unpolarized Fermi sea; $\omega = \Omega_{PL}\sqrt{\frac{\gamma_0}{e^2}}(1 + \frac{9}{5}\frac{e^2}{\gamma_0}\frac{1}{q_{TF}^2})^{1/2}q$. For the case of complete spin-polarization $\zeta = 1$, the frequency and wave number dependence of various longitudinal susceptibilities given by Eqs. (6) to (9) becomes the same and the condition for the longitudinal collective modes is given by

$$1 - \Pi_{\sigma\sigma}^0[v(1 - 2G_\sigma^{xc}) + 4\pi\gamma_0] = 0. \quad (27)$$

If we set $\Pi_{\sigma\sigma}^0 \neq \Pi_{\bar{\sigma}\bar{\sigma}}^0$ but $G_\sigma^\pm = G_{\bar{\sigma}}^\pm$, Eq. (22) becomes

$$0 = 1 - v(\Pi_{\sigma\sigma}^0 + \Pi_{\bar{\sigma}\bar{\sigma}}^0)(1 - G_\sigma^+) + [\Pi_{\sigma\sigma}^0 + \Pi_{\bar{\sigma}\bar{\sigma}}^0 - 4v\Pi_{\sigma\sigma}^0\Pi_{\bar{\sigma}\bar{\sigma}}^0(1 - G_\sigma^+)](vG_\sigma^- - 4\pi\gamma_0). \quad (28)$$

Taking the external magnetic disturbance $\vec{b}_0$ as our effective magnetic disturbance in Eq. (2), instead of the self-consistent field $\vec{b}$, makes the factor $4\pi\gamma_0$ on the right hand side of Eq. (28) disappears, and the expression reduces to the result of an infinitesimally spin polarized system⁵.

In summary, a unified treatment of the response of the spin polarized electron gas is presented in this paper and general expressions for various susceptibility functions are derived. The present results reproduce exactly the known results for several simple situations. Spin-polarization dependence of the HF local fields is displayed explicitly. We believe that our results could be useful in understanding electric, magnetic, and optical properties of a number of spin polarized systems like ferromagnetics and diluted magnetic semiconductors.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported in part by the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, managed by Lockheed Martin Energy Research Corp. for the US Department of Energy under the contract No. DE-AC05-96OR22464. One of the authors(K.S.Y.) appreciates the supports by the 1995 program of the Korea Research Foundation and in part by the BSRI-96-2412 program of the Ministry of Education, Korea. The authors would like to thank Drs. J. Cooke, G. F. Giuliani, A. W. Overhauser, and P. Vashishta for helpful comments.

-
- ¹ P. Vashishta and K. S. Singwi, Solid State Commun. **13**, 901 (1973).
 - ² D. J. Kim, B. B. Schwartz, and H. C. Praddaude, Phys. Rev. B **7**, 205 (1973).
 - ³ A. K. Rajagopal, J. Rath, and J. C. Kimball, Phys. Rev. B **7**, 2657 (1973).
 - ⁴ O. Gunnarsson and B. I. Lundqvist, Phys. Rev. B **13**, 4274 (1976).
 - ⁵ S. Yarlagadda and G. F. Giuliani, Phys. Rev. B **49**, 7887 (1994).
 - ⁶ C. A. Kukkonen and A. W. Overhauser, Phys. Rev. B **20**, 550 (1979).
 - ⁷ X. Zhu and A. W. Overhauser, Phys. Rev. B **33**, 925 (1986).
 - ⁸ M. P. Greene, H. J. Lee, J. J. Quinn, and S. Rodriguez, Phys. Rev. **177**, 1019 (1969).
 - ⁹ M. M. Pant and A. K. Rajagopal, Solid State Commun. **10**, 1157 (1971).
 - ¹⁰ A. L. Fetter and J. D. Walecka, *Quantum Theory of Many-Particle Systems* (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1971).